

emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine democratic processes or institutions of Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2018.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 8, 2018.

#### IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I would say, first of all, I want to compliment the gentleman on the selection of his tie—the nice Washington Capitals red tie that he has on. Everybody behind me who is dressed in red and up there dressed in red, Mr. Speaker, has to be celebrating the jinx being broken and the Washington Capitals winning the Stanley Cup last night. The streets were full of people celebrating.

By the way, it was fairly calm, considering the exhilaration that drove all of that. A few people came here a little tired today, but with a big smile on their face. So a lot of happy, tired people in Washington, D.C. My congratulations goes out to them.

I came here today speak about a topic that has been essentially consuming a lot of our time here in these debates, Mr. Speaker, and that is this topic of immigration.

We had a 2-hour conference on Thursday morning from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.—it may have gone after that a little ways—to try to reach a resolution. It seems as though we got about the same kind of conclusion with our effort to reach a resolution as they did in the United States Senate when they debated on the floor of the Senate for 4 days on immigration issues, trying to get a consensus to bring any single bill out of the Senate that could get enough votes to pass. They fell short and nothing passed. That was Feb-

ruary. I think some people have a sense of a consensus from the meeting yesterday, but I do not believe that we have anything that gets to 218 votes.

So, generally, Mr. Speaker, the conservatives and Republicans would agree with four of the five pillars that President Trump has laid out. I don't know if I will get them exactly right, but one is to build the wall. Another one is to secure the border. Another one is to end chain migration. Another one is to establish merit-based immigration, instead of having it be the chain migration that we have experienced.

I recall witnesses before the Immigration Committee years ago who testified that between 7 and 11 percent of our legal immigration in America—the legal immigration in America—only between 7 and 11 percent is based upon anything that we have control over, which presumably would be merit.

The balance of the legal immigration, then, is really not in the control of the American people or in the control of the United States Congress. It is in the control of the people who are, I will say, utilizing the current policy that we have, that we can't find the consensus to reverse. And those who are coming in the country sometimes by hook, by crook, and shenanigan, and sometimes just simply exploiting the laws that we have.

So it has always been very simple for me, Mr. Speaker; that is, we need to secure the border. Without a border you don't have a nation. Any sovereign nation has to secure its borders and has to control those borders. That goes for any sovereign nation all over the world, including the Vatican.

I look at that big, 30-foot-tall wall around the Vatican and understand that they don't have an open borders policy there. Neither do other countries around the world, except for the United States of America, who, under the 8 of years of Barack Obama, watched the rule of law be so eroded that it has clouded the minds of a lot of Republicans here in the House of Representatives.

There was a question asked yesterday that I wrote down here that I think is really important to contemplate. I hadn't put it in those kind of words before, although I had thought about it and I actually did research on it. And the question is this: I'll put it this way—this discussion, by the way, on immigration, the sticking point is about DACA, Deferred Action For Childhood Arrivals.

So the question that was posed was this: We stopped the entire political world for these people, DACA recipients. So the question was posed: Who are they? Who are they?

We hear continually they are valedictorians or they came across the border on their mother's arm when they were 3 years old. They know no country but this one. They only speak one language: English. They don't have a memory of any other country. They study hard and work hard and get good

grades. Some of them even say that they are as fine a group of people as we can select out of American citizens.

So I began asking some of those questions of our bureaucracy. I had actually begun asking those questions as far back as last September and intensified the request in January and focused on it very hard.

With a lot of work to try to get to the bottom of it, I found out a number of things about who are the DACA recipients. First, I want to characterize, just a little bit, about how we got here.

Barack Obama made DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, made it his tool for an unconstitutional amnesty. We should not forget, Barack Obama, on at least 22 different locations and times, said on videotape that he didn't have the constitutional authority to create this DACA policy.

He said at a school here in Washington, D.C., not that long ago, before he left office, before he implemented the DACA policy, he said: You are smart students here; you understand this. He said: I can't write the laws. Congress writes laws. The President and the executive branch carry out those laws, execute those laws, and the court interprets the laws. So it is up to Congress to change the policy.

But just a couple of months after that statement, President Obama implemented by executive edict a DACA policy that no thinking constitutionalist can really take the position that it is anything other than utterly, blatantly, and self-confessed by Barack Obama unconstitutional.

Yet, we have had a couple of Federal Judges who say that President Trump, who was elected to end the DACA policy—and we all expected that January 20, 2017, at noon, when President Trump took his oath of office, he would have already had the order ready to go that would have ended the DACA policy and stopped any new permits from being issued and stopped any renewals of existing permits, and perhaps even cancel the existing ones that were there, but that didn't happen.

Five to six weeks later, Mr. Speaker, we learned that the Trump administration was still issuing new DACA permits in just as unconstitutional a fashion as Barack Obama was. He just wasn't the author of it. He wasn't the creator of it. President Trump wasn't the creator of it. He was the continuer of the unconstitutional DACA policy created and established by Barack Obama.

So there were extensions, renewals of existing, and there were creations and new permits handed out for DACA. We all knew it was unconstitutional.

Then, as we went along, I want to really thank a number of States, but in particular, Texas, who put together a lawsuit, to file a lawsuit, on the unconstitutional policy of DACA, which is costing Texas taxpayers money and opportunity and every other State in the Union, as far as I know, money and opportunity.

Ken Paxton, the Attorney General of Texas, prepared a lawsuit that he had, I believe the number were 12 states that agreed to join with that suit, and they were prepared to file that suit last September 5, was the date.

Yet, they negotiated with the White House. So, President Trump agreed to end the DACA policy. He took this action last September 5. Part of that negotiation was so that the lawsuit would not be filed by Texas and other states. Because clearly, they would prevail. DACA is unconstitutional.

President Trump conceded, apparently, that point and ended the DACA policy effective in 6 months, which would be the 5th of March this year.

□ 1400

Then he challenged Congress to pass legislation that would resolve the DACA issue and resolve the balance of the immigration issues that we have. That deadline, presumably, was March 5.

However, there were a couple of Federal judges who decided that they were legislators, and they came to a decision, an order, that said that President Trump couldn't cancel the DACA policy, that he is compelled to continue it, to issue new permits, and to extend existing permits, for no constitutional reason that I am aware of and no statutory reason that I am aware of, just activist judges who are seeking to legislate from the bench and impose their personal policy preference on the rest of America.

Well, that can't stand, Mr. Speaker. We know that can't stand. It has got to get to the Supreme Court. And the Supreme Court, in nobody's imagination, is going to come down with a decision that says that a preceding President can implement a blatantly and clearly and, I said, self-confessedly—that is a word, I hope, “self-confessedly”—illegal policy, unconstitutional policy.

Barack Obama established that policy.

No Supreme Court is going to say: And by the way, every succeeding President has to accept the executive actions of his predecessor no matter how unconstitutional they are; that he can't end, by executive action, something that was unconstitutionally implemented by the executive action of his predecessor, Barack Obama.

But that is the decision that we have right now before the courts. Thankfully, Attorney General Ken Paxton of Texas ramped this back up again, and they are going back to court now. This goes before Judge Hanen, who has been a stellar constitutionalist, an originalist, and a textualist.

I appreciate the work he has done in the past. I can't speak to his decision coming up on this, except this, that we have the rule of law sitting here hanging in the balance. That is what has been pushed into the middle of the table. That is the bet, the rule of law, up or down.

And if the court is allowed to resolve this issue, whether it is before Judge

Hanen's circuit court or whether it goes on to the Supreme Court, which I expect it would, the Supreme Court will come down with a decision that allows and recognizes that the Chief Executive Officer of the United States of America—right now, President Donald Trump—has the authority to reverse any executive action of any of his predecessors.

That is how our Constitution is structured. And if it is any other way, if a President can, by executive action, visit a horrible policy on the American people and we don't have a way to undo that, our Founding Fathers didn't serve us up a document like that. They gave us a document with checks and balances and the authorities to be set up in a proportional way.

So DACA, if it is allowed to continue through the litigation process, will be thrown out by the Supreme Court. Let's let that happen. Let's find out. I am willing to take a Supreme Court decision on this, because if it goes the other way, our Republic is essentially lost anyway.

So who are these people? Who are they?

Well, Barack Obama made this a tool for his unconstitutional method of getting people, I will say, quasi-legalized. When that happened, specifics went out the window. When you read through these documents—and I have finally gotten my hands on the documents, Mr. Speaker. Each one of the applications is a 7-page application.

Altogether, there are about 2 million applications. Roughly half of them are renewals. That means there are 14 million pieces of paper, a lot of them filled out by hand, in fact, most of them filled out by hand. They only went electronic in 2015, I believe November 1 of 2015. So it is hard to pull the data out. That is why we had to work so hard to get it.

Some other things that came along that we are learning from reading through the press:

We are finding more and more DACA recipients who are MS-13. We shouldn't be surprised at that. A lot of them came in as unaccompanied alien minors. Then they get recruited into gangs, or they came in as a member of a gang.

They weren't all 3-year-old girls brought across the Rio Grande River by their mother. A whole lot of them were unaccompanied alien minors. And some of them who were accompanied went right into the highest gang areas in the country, MS-13 gang areas.

There is a large percentage of them who are also prime gang-age recruitment. Out of 817,000 DACA recipients, that universe who are currently under DACA, there are about 135,000 who were prime gang-age recruitment from that 13-, 14-, 15-year-old age.

To remind folks, Mr. Speaker, we had the Drug Enforcement Administration Chief Administrator there, Robert Patterson, before the Judiciary Committee a couple of weeks ago. I asked him a se-

ries of questions. Here is one of the things that he concurred on: 80 percent to 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, 80 percent to 90 percent of those illegal drugs.

We have had 64,000 Americans die because of drug overdose, primarily opioid abuse, and at least two-thirds of that are illegal opioids.

The physicians are getting this under control, tightening down their prescriptions. They addressed this some time ago.

But the illegal drugs are killing Americans, and those illegal drugs are coming from or through Mexico, 80 percent to 90 percent of them.

It is a matter of note that—I will find this along the way. But over a period of about 3 years, from 2013 until 2016—and that is the first year, 2013 was the first year after the DACA announcement—the Mexican poppy fields tripled in acres. They tripled in size.

We wonder why we have a heroin problem and an opioid problem in the United States and where it comes from: from or through Mexico, by the testimony of Robert Patterson.

We also have that the drug crisis is directly related to the growth of MS-13. That is a statement that was made by Commissioner Geraldine Hart, Commissioner of Suffolk County, Long Island, New York. That is some of the information that is in here.

So who are they? Who are the DACA recipients, Mr. Speaker?

As I dug through the records and finally got my hands on the data, one of the hardest pieces of information I have ever had to work for in this town—and the nature of this town makes you work for information that politically they don't want you to have. Well, I have it now in my hands. And I will say no other Member of Congress has this information, and it has not been shared outside of a very tight circle in my own shop.

Here are some things:

The overall number of DACA recipients, 817,798 is the overall number—817,798.

I began looking down through those records, and of those who even filled out the form, that they came in too early, that they would be disqualified because they came in too early or they would be disqualified because they came in too late, the initial entry dates disqualify, of the 817,798, 8,964 of them because they didn't fit the parameters of the dates that they had to have come into the United States, some for the first time.

Another 2,100, their records are not available. They just simply don't have those records. If we are going to make sure that they are getting an education and learning English and working and that whole list of meritorious things that you always hear about when people talk about DACA, the least they could do is fill out the form. So there are 2,100 records that are not available.

Then they transferred the application form into form N-400 about that time in late winter of 2015, early winter of 2016. They transferred it over to form N-400. That is a foundational document that can be transferred into citizenship. So they set up the bookwork to turn them into citizens clear back then.

It always was the unconstitutional, lawless plan of Barack Obama to push this all on us. I will say I thought Republicans were stronger than they seemed to be. He must have had them judged just about right, because he thought he could feed this to us, but he also believed that Hillary Clinton would be the President of the United States.

How many of them traveled out of the United States?

"They are afraid to go back home." "They don't know any other country but this country." We have heard this over and over again. But 775 confessed on the form that they had gone back to their home country. That should disqualify them.

Of those who already reported that they were too old to qualify, over age 31 by the closing date, there were 2,464 who were too old to qualify.

And here is the number of those who were prime gang recruitment age: 135,250 of them. But that also includes boys and girls. Of the boys and girls, more boys get recruited, of course, by far, but the girls are being recruited, too. We know how bad that can be.

That is just up to age 16. The legislation that they want to bring to this floor takes it to age 18, and that adds about another 33,000 or 34,000 for each year. So that number, then, would go to 100—let's see. Well, 66,000 to 68,000 more on top of that, so just round that up. It would be 200,000 would be the universe from which MS-13 and other gangs would recruit while they waited for the younger kids to get a little older.

They are growing up in these MS-13 neighborhoods. They are being delivered to MS-13 neighborhoods. We are eroding the culture of the civilization of America with this policy, and everybody is afraid to say who they are. Nobody is even asking the question. They are just saying, "valedictorian," "3-year-old girls."

There are a few who are. I found them in this data, too. Actually, they are a little better represented than I expected they would be, but that is only my judgment, not the data.

On education: They are supposed to be getting an education. Here is what I found out from looking at the education: no data available.

We are out of this universe of 817,798, Mr. Speaker. Out of that universe, there were 564,103 where there was no data available at all in their application on education.

Were they going to school or weren't they? Did they have an education of any kind? Where did it take them to? Was it sixth grade? third grade? 11th grade? No data available.

That is 68.9 percent of the DACA recipients we don't have even a record that they ever went to school.

I have to believe a good number of them went to school but not long enough, apparently, to write that down on this form. And most of them had help filling out the applications. That is those where the records were not available.

Then they have this mushy question in there that is designed—this whole thing is designed to grant amnesty, so the questions are asked in such a way, when you read through there, that it was never designed to understand and get an honest reporting that came out.

Regardless, those who have no diploma and may or may not be in school, that is another 179,719, or 21.9 percent. They say, well, they don't have a degree, they don't have a diploma, they may or may not be in school, by the way the question was asked.

In any case, if you add together those with no data available and those with no verification of any kind of educational experience, that comes to 90.8 percent of all of the DACA recipients without a validation of their education. Of those who attest that they qualify—now, remember, there is no verification here. All the stuff on this 7-page document they attest to, but the verification is almost nonexistent, although there is a little bit. Of those who attest they are qualified by education, that is 9.2 percent is all.

So I found myself adding up these things and seeing what is the worst-case scenario.

Oh, the best-case scenario is believe everything and expect that there is an excuse for 564,000 not even putting out a number on the form.

So I began to add this up. I think I left some things out, though, Mr. Speaker. I will start this way.

Of 817,798, you would subtract from that the 564,103 that they had no data on for education at all, because they would have been disqualified by the requirements of the program.

The second group, you can't tell whether they went to school or not. That is 179,719. Subtract that. They are disqualified, also, because you can't tell.

Oh, here is a really interesting one. Of those who confessed to being criminals, 66 percent of those who self-reported that they are criminals, they received their DACA permit. Two-thirds of those who said "I am a criminal" got their DACA permit anyway.

Those are the initial applications. Then, once their status was up for renewal, of the group who said they—that was a much bigger group then, those up for renewal. 31,854 of them were granted. The 94 percent of the roughly 33,000 or so altogether, 94 percent of them got renewed even though they said, "I am a criminal."

So we are not really cleaning out the folks that we wouldn't want in this group, and it is getting harder and

harder to find the ones you would want in this group.

Then, of those based upon the data entry I mentioned earlier, 8,964, they would be out, disqualified; 2,100 with no data available, they would be disqualified; And of those who went back home, it disqualifies them, also, because they knew when they came back in that they were violating the law. It wasn't through no fault of their own. That is 775.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you have added this up in your head, as I have run through these numbers, and the conclusion you will have drawn is that, of the 817,798 DACA recipients on record at the time we pulled this data off last month, there was 789,851 of them who would be disqualified on the records because they didn't meet the standards that were put down by Barack Obama that were designed to give amnesty in the first place. That is how bad these records are.

I can't believe these people are these bad, but the records certainly are horrible, and we are here pontificating as if we know what we are doing. Statesmen and women here are deciding: Oh, yeah, I can give amnesty to DACA recipients because it is the humane thing to do. It is the right thing to do for the country. Don't call it amnesty because it hurts my feelings. And, by the way, we need to do this because if we don't give amnesty to DACA recipients, we can't get the money for the wall, and we can't pass the border security, and we can't end chain migration, and we can't pass Kate's Law, and we can't pass Sarah's Law, and we can't end sanctuary cities.

Really? This United States of America, this shining city on a hill, this stellar country that has eclipsed anything that any country has ever done before, we can't restore the essential pillar of American exceptionalism called the rule of law? In fact, Mr. Speaker, when Ronald Reagan spoke of the shining city on a hill, I always thought a little bit differently. I was always inspired by the image that he drew, but America is, instead, a shining city built upon pillars, and those pillars are the pillars of American exceptionalism, and most of them are in the bill of rights.

You have a pillar for freedom of speech, a pillar for freedom of religion, a pillar for freedom of the press, a pillar for freedom of assembly. We have a pillar for Second Amendment rights to keep and bear arms, and then we have a pillar for property rights and one for no double jeopardy and a jury of your peers and the enumerated powers in the Constitution, the framework of the intergenerational contractual guarantee, which is our Constitution, all of that is there.

It leaves out a couple of things in the Constitution. It doesn't point out that this is a Judeo-Christian society with a belief and a moral foundation that

guides us in our everyday life and a level of expectations of living up to American standards, that is not there. But it is a pillar of American exceptionalism. It is a pillar of the shining city on the pillars. And free enterprise, capitalism, is another component.

All of these things come together to make America great. You know, you can maybe wound two or three of those pillars, and we would still be a great Nation. But the central pillar—think of these others that I have described all around a circle holding up that city, but the middle, the important one, the central pillar of American exceptionalism is the rule of law. It is sacrosanct to a free people. If we don't live by the rule of law, our country collapses, our other pillars fall, and we fall into the Third World.

And yet, this Congress is in the business right now of negotiating away the rule of law under some myopic belief that if we just reward this group of people for breaking the law, somehow the rest of those folks that are out there in other sympathetic categories are just going to go away and say: Sorry, I guess I missed the boat; I wasn't DACA; I was a parent that brought DACA in; or I got in too early and so I was disqualified; or I got in too late and I was disqualified. These are all illegal entries, by the way. Or I came into America, had a baby with an anchor baby. Now I am a parent of an American. How do we split up families?

You have to draw a line. The only place to draw the line is right down the rule of law, and we cannot be supporting amnesty. To grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crime.

What nation does that? What thinking nation would do such a thing when we have got so much at stake; and how this multiplies itself throughout the generations?

1986 Ronald Reagan made one mistake. He signed the amnesty act of 1986. We have been paying for that ever since because it created the expectation that there would be other amnesties.

There have been at least six other minor amnesties since then. This is the big one. This is at least as big as Ronald Reagan, and it sets the stage for another 10 to 20 million people rewarded for breaking American law. And what do we tell our children and what will our descendants think if we can't think any more clearly than we appear to be doing right now?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, just to follow up on what my good friend from

Iowa (Mr. KING) was saying, there is an article here from this week—Hans A. von Spakovsky says: "Alabama is arguing that by including illegal immigrants in its count of the population, it deprives the State of representation in the U.S. House of Representatives. The key to Alabama's case is the definition of 'persons' who should be counted and thus used in apportionment. This is not an issue the court has addressed before."

That is interesting.

"Alabama has filed an unprecedented but little-noticed lawsuit against the U.S. Census Bureau. If the State wins, it could have major political ramifications and restore fundamental fairness in political representation in Congress."

And I might insert parenthetically here, I heard my friend, the delegate from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) was talking about hoping to have a vote, whether it was making D.C. a State or whatnot. But in the little research that I ended up doing after I got here is I have seen the license plate, "Taxation without representation." I thought: Well, you know, of course, that was something that was said during the Revolution, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." Ben Franklin said, if we don't get to elect even one of the members of parliament that put taxes on us, then they should not be able to put taxes on us.

So I am familiar with that situation, but I didn't know, until after I had been here awhile, I find out that territories, like—or any U.S. property that is not part of a State, they do not have a U.S. representative because the Constitution is very clear, very succinct, it says that the representative shall come from the several States.

In the late 1970s, all of the proponents of giving Washington, D.C. a representative, a U.S. representative, they understood there is only one way to do that, and that is to have a constitutional amendment to amend where it says the representative shall come from the several States and include, and the District of Columbia, something like that.

Well, they passed it with a significant percentage in the House and the Senate that allowed it to go forward as a constitutional amendment, but they never got—in the late 1970s, they never got the requisite number of States because I guess, from the State standpoint, they are thinking: Well, if we ratify this as a constitutional amendment, it slightly, but still does, dilute a little bit of our power in the House of Representatives. So it didn't get the requisite number of States.

But, again, after I was here, I was talking to a friend from Puerto Rico, and I said: I know there have been votes in the past about whether Puerto Ricans want to be a State or not. Why has that not passed previously? This is several years ago.

And he said: Well, there are people that kind of like the current situation

in Puerto Rico. It is the same as in Guam or the Mariana Islands or the U.S. Virgin Islands—all the areas that are not States, they are territories—because in those, as in Puerto Rico, because they do not elect a full voting representative into the U.S. House or Senate, then the Founders, up through the current time, have said it is not fair. Just like Ben Franklin said, it is not fair to make them pay Federal income tax, Federal tax, if they don't elect a full voting representative.

So there is no U.S. territory, no non-State U.S. property that has to pay Federal income tax if they are not a State that elects a representative, except for the District of Columbia.

And once I realized that, I went: Well, it may not seem to people to be a Republican issue, but that really is not fair for the District of Columbia, because the people in the District of Columbia pay Federal income tax.

So if we are really going to be consistent, we are really going to be fair to the people of the District of Columbia, there is only one thing to do: Either make them a State, which a form of that was tried in the 1970s and it didn't work, or the other—actually there are three things. The other is to make the law as it is for every other non-State, that the residents of that non-State do not pay Federal income tax.

So I filed that bill in a number of the Congresses, including this one. It was very basic, you know—residents of Washington, District of Columbia, will not pay Federal income tax, just like all the other territories. And I have been intrigued that I have not gotten support from Democrats, including the delegate from the District of Columbia.

I understand, you know, folks like my colleague want to have a full voting U.S. representative. Fine. But why not let your constituents at least be treated like every other resident U.S. citizen of a non-State. Don't make them pay income tax until you get what you want. Maybe some day you'll get it, but until you do, why don't you join forces with me and just say: We want to pass this law; we are going to be fair to the residents of Washington, D.C. just like we are to all the other non-States that are U.S. territories; we are going to say you don't pay Federal income tax.

But I have been amazed that I am still not getting support from the other side of the aisle, just to be fair, until they—I am not in favor of making the District of Columbia a State. I like what the Founders did, with that one exception, they should not have to pay tax since they don't elect a full voting representative.

So, anyway, I am hoping that at some point at least one or more of my Democratic friends will join forces with me and maybe we can push that issue to the floor so we can treat the residents of the District of Columbia fairly. But until the person representing the people here in the District of Columbia disagree, then it is